

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

Chase Ventler,

Plaintiff,

v.

Citibank NA,

Defendant.

:
:
: Civil Action No.: _____
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Chase Ventler, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendant's repeated violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* ("TCPA").
2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

3. The Plaintiff, Chase Ventler ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Marysville, Washington, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).
4. The Defendant, Citibank NA ("Citibank"), is a New York business entity with an address of 399 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10043, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

FACTS

5. In or around December 2017, Citibank started calling Plaintiff's cellular

telephone, number 425-xxx-0401, in an attempt to collect a consumer debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff.

6. At all times mentioned herein, Citibank contacted Plaintiff using an automated telephone dialer system (“ATDS” or “predictive dialer”) and/or by using an artificial or prerecorded voice.

7. When Plaintiff answered the calls from Citibank, he heard a prerecorded message instructing Plaintiff to hold for the next available representative.

8. During a live conversation in January 2018, Plaintiff demanded that all calls to him cease immediately.

9. Nonetheless, Citibank continued to place automated calls to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA – 47 U.S.C. § 227, ET SEQ.

10. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

11. At all times mentioned herein and within the last four years, Defendant called Plaintiff on his cellular telephone using an ATDS or predictive dialer and/or by using a prerecorded or artificial voice.

12. Defendant continued to place automated calls to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone after being directed by Plaintiff to cease calling and knowing there was no consent to continue the calls. As such, each call placed to Plaintiff was made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, and subject to treble damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

13. The telephone number called by Defendant was and is assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs charges for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

14. Plaintiff was annoyed, harassed and inconvenienced by Defendant's continued calls.

15. The calls from Defendant to Plaintiff were not placed for "emergency purposes" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).

16. Each of the aforementioned calls made by Defendant constitutes a violation of the TCPA.

17. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each call placed in violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

18. As a result of each call made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of treble damages in an amount up to \$1,500.00 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant:

- A. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each violation determined to be negligent pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
- B. Treble damages for each violation determined to be willful and/or knowing pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C);
- C. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: January 16, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg, Esq. (SL 6331)

LEMBERG LAW, L.L.C.

43 Danbury Road, 3rd Floor

Wilton, CT 06897

Telephone: (203) 653-2250

Facsimile: (203) 653-3424

Attorneys for Plaintiff